<u>REMARKS</u>

The present application includes claims 2-18, 20-25, and 40-42. Claims 3, 6, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 25 were objected to. Claims 2-18, 20-25, and 40-42 were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 3, 6, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 25 have been amended.

Claims 3, 6, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 25 were objected to by the Examiner based on several informalities. The claims have been amended as identified by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 20, 40, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thacker, U.S. Patent No. 6,011,548.

Claims 3, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Wilis, U.S. Patent No. 6,584,082.

Claims 5, 14, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatchtable over Thacker in view of Haugli, U.S. Patent No. 6,522,638.

Claims 6, 15, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Lalwaney, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,377.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Ducharme, U.S. Patent No. 5,930,515.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claim 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, claim 40 includes the limitation "wherein said integrated satellite receiver and router does not include a satellite transmitter", and the Examiner requests assistance in finding support for the claim language in the application.

Figure 8 of the present application illustrates a preferred satellite transmission system 10, as recited beginning on page 35. As described beginning at the bottom of page 36, the system 10 includes a satellite uplink 28 which transmits signals to a satellite 20. The satellite 20 in turn transmits signals to a satellite downlink 31 "remote from the uplink 28." The satellite downlink 31 delivers the signals it receives to a connected integrated receiver and router including the Starguide® II Satellite Receiver 32 and the EDS Card 34, as shown in Figure 8.

Thus, Figure 8 clearly shows that the satellite transmitter is remote from the receiver/router. Further, the specification explicitly recites that the transmitter "is remote from" the downlink location, where the receiver/router is positioned. Thus, the present claim limitation is supported in the specification. However, if the Examiner would prefer different language for claim 40, the applicant would be willing to consider revising the claim limitation to read "wherein the integrated satellite receiver and router is remote from a satellite transmitter."

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 20, 40, 41, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Thacker, U.S. Patent No. 11 of 14

6,011,548. Thacker is cited under 102(e) and was filed on September 4, 1998. However, the present application claims priority to a provisional patent application filed April 3, 1998, App. No. 60/080,530. The provisional filing pre-dates Thacker by several months and consequently Thacker is not prior art to the present application.

Consequently, the present rejection is respectfully traversed and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 20, 40, 41, and 42 are free of the prior art and allowable.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 3, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Wilis, U.S. Patent No. 6,584,082. As mentioned above, Thacker is not prior art to the present application. Consequently, the present rejection is respectfully traversed and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, and 22 are free of the prior art and allowable.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 5, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Haugli, U.S. Patent No. 6,522,638. As mentioned above, Thacker is not prior art to the present application. Consequently, the present rejection is respectfully traversed and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25, 14, and 24 are free of the prior art and allowable.

12 of 14

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 6, 15, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Lalwaney, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,377. As mentioned above, Thacker is not prior art to the present application. Consequently, the present rejection is respectfully traversed and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 15, 23, and 25 are free of the prior art and allowable.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thacker in view of Ducharme, U.S. Patent No. 5,930,515. As mentioned above, Thacker is not prior art to the present application. Consequently, the present rejection is respectfully traversed and the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is free of the prior art and allowable.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017. Additionally, please charge any fees for any additional claims or for any extension of time to the Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 18, 2005

Joseph M. Barich Registration No. 42.291

MCANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD. 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: Facsimile:

(312) 775-8000 (312) 775-8100